

Federal Government which has different philosophical thinking and priorities. I just do not understand why we do not respect our Federal worker more.

Some of us have traveled in other countries; we have read about other countries, we have dealt with other countries, and we know that their federal governments, their government workers are not respected to the extent they should be because they have not been treated correctly. They work at a lower rate of pay, they do not get the respect that they deserve over the years, and as a result, they do not function like our Federal Government has always functioned and its workers.

Our workers are proud of what they do, they go to work in the morning, they do a full day's work, they go home at night, they are with their families and they are very, very good citizens. They should not be put in the vise of this budget resolution.

Tomorrow we should have a continuing resolution on this floor and on the Senate floor, and our Government should go on.

Then I hear people saying, well, what is happening about the budget; and it is said, you know, that there is a group that does not want the budget, the new freshman class, they are saying, no, you cannot have this particular budget unless it has what we want in it. you cannot do it that way.

First I heard a young man down here talking tonight and he was talking about the President of the United States, the President, another President, a former President saying, "The buck stops here." We did have a former President that said that. But they are not letting the buck stop here with this President.

Yesterday we had the President of the Senate, Mr. DOLE, and the speaker of the House, Mr. GINGRICH, go to the White House. All of the television cameras were on, and the two gentleman walked in and sat down with the President and they began some discussion; they came out, and it looked like we were going to have some progress, and we all felt so good.

Yet today we hear that, no, the 73 freshmen are not exactly satisfied with what happened there.

Well, you cannot have it both ways. You cannot have it: "The buck stops here," and the: "We want to all be involved." The negotiations, any negotiations, breaking it down to a smaller group with only the leaders. In Dayton, they sent the Presidents of those countries and they sat down at the table and they figured out what was going on. They could not bring all of the countries with them.

So what I am saying is why do we not all step out of the way and decide what is happening and come back and vote on it. Let us let the leaders lead.

PRESIDENT SHOULD GET SERIOUS ABOUT BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, 31 days ago, President Clinton committed to balancing the budget in a signed contract with Congress that stated: "The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002 as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office * * *." Since that time, however, it has become more apparent that this President has no intention of living up to the agreement.

Last October, the 104th Congress passed a balanced budget, one that finally reforms the Nation's welfare system, provides pro-family and pro-jobs tax relief, and saves Medicare from bankruptcy. For 26 years our Federal Government has continued deficit spending, crippling the Nation with a national debt of nearly \$5 trillion and jeopardizing the future prosperity of our Nation. This is our last, best hope to do the right thing for the future of our children and grandchildren.

The President claimed he could not agree to our budget and used his Constitutional authority to veto it. This is his right, but in exercising his power to veto he has a moral obligation to present the American people with an honest alternative.

After 4 weeks we are still waiting for him to present us with a budget that balances in accordance with the terms agreed to last month.

Instead of a comprehensive budget proposal, we have received press releases and rhetoric. Instead of negotiating in good faith to seek an agreeable compromise, the President and his allies produced and aired commercials bashing our proposal even before sitting down at the negotiating table. The President talks about compromise but in reality has only engaged in confrontation and demagoguery.

Last Friday, President Clinton submitted yet another budget that comes no where close to balance in 7 years according to the honest, nonpartisan CBO. In 2002, when our budget would produce a surplus, his plan remains at least \$75 billion short. This is the same "we'll get to it some day" mentality that has overshadowed this issue for decades and left us in the current deficit mess we have today.

When put to a vote before this House, the President's budget did not get one single vote—not one Republican vote, not one Democratic vote.

The day before the vote on the President's budget, the House voted overwhelmingly, by a vote of 351 to 40, to reaffirm our commitment to a 7-year balanced budget as determined by the Congressional Budget Office signed by December 31, 1995.

Taken together, that should be a clear signal to the President to get serious about a balanced budget.

Today, however, we get another sign that the President still has not gotten serious. Today the President once again broke his word and broke off negotiations, continuing the partial shutdown of the Federal Government.

I, for one, will not support another continuing resolution until the President lives up to the agreement he made law.

In 1992, President Clinton campaigned on a balanced budget, ending welfare as we know it, and providing tax relief for America's middle class working families—our proposal simply follows through on what this President could not. We have kept our word to the American people and attempted to negotiate in good faith for an agreement both sides could live with. Has the President? Strip away the rhetoric and there is little evidence he truly wants a balanced budget.

NO LINKAGE BETWEEN CR AND BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, let us make no mistake about this. It is the Republicans who are shutting down the Government. Clearly and simply, the Republicans, by refusing to vote for a continuing resolution to keep the Government open, are shutting down the Government. They have the majority of votes here and in the Senate, they could easily keep the Government open by voting for a clean continuing resolution with no strings attached, no blackmail attached, and the Government would open and 250,000 Federal workers would go back to work, and then we could negotiate a budget.

But no, they will not do that, because they are trying to link the two issues together; they are saying they will vote for no continuing resolution until there is a 7-year balanced budget.

Now, I want everybody to understand that there is no linkage to keeping the Government open with a continuing resolution and a balanced budget. The Republicans are the ones who are linking it. The reason we are in trouble in the first place is because they did not do their job.

October 1, 1995 was the start of the new fiscal year, and there are 13 appropriations bills which the Republicans were supposed to have sent to the President of the United States, and by that time they had sent only 3 So it is their fault that the Government could not continue and that the Government had to shut down; and the only way you can keep the Government open under those circumstances, when the majority party does not do its job by sending the appropriations bills to the President, is by passing a continuing resolution. They are refusing to do that.

All of this talk and rhetoric about balancing the budget in 7 years is a separate issue from the continuing resolution and from the Government shutdown. The President of the United

States has said, and rightfully so, that he will not be blackmailed into accepting the Republican mean-spirited and extreme agenda.

Yes, the majority of Americans want to see a balanced budget, but when you ask the majority of Americans, do you want to see a balanced budget at the expense of Medicare and Medicaid, if it means devastating Medicare and Medicaid, the American people overwhelmingly say no. Well, on the Democratic side of the aisle we say that Medicare and Medicaid and education and the environment and helping working people and not giving a tax break for the rich are Democratic priorities.

□ 1830

While the President did agree 31 days ago to have a 7-year balanced budget, CBO-scored, the Republicans also agreed to protect the Democratic priorities of Medicare, Medicaid, education, the environment, and student loans.

It seems to me that the President, by accepting the concept of a 7-year balanced budget, CBO-scored, has done more to compromise with what the Republicans want to see than the Republicans are doing to compromise with the Democrats. Instead, we get this mean-spirited, extreme attitude, "We're going to shut the Government down if we don't get our way."

NEWT GINGRICH came to the Republican Conference this morning attempting to compromise, apparently, and he was told, "No, we are not going to have a continuing resolution, we're going to shut the Government down." This from the party that talks about family values. A quarter of a million American workers before Christmas are thrown out of work, and they talk about family values.

Congress is going to be in session next week, so we cannot be with our families. They talk about family values. Now, I do not mind Congress being in session if we are actually doing something, but we have been sitting around here all day long today and yesterday while the Republicans are caucusing and not getting anything done, not doing the people's work, arguing, quibbling, passing ridiculous, irrelevant resolutions instead of passing the continuing resolution to get Government open again.

That is the truth. So do not talk to me about family values, do not talk to me about balanced budgets, when you are the ones that are not allowing compromises to be made.

We talk about health care, whether it is a cut in Medicare or just a lessening of an increase, the bottom line is senior citizens in my district and in everybody's districts are on Medicare and Medicaid. The health care coverage is inadequate now. They do not have enough money now to buy medicine.

But let us look at the health care that seniors are getting now in 1995, and what kind of health care will they be getting in 2002 under the Republican plan? The answer is seniors will be paying more and getting less. They will

not have the choice. They will be thrown into HMO's. They will not have a choice.

So let us stop the nonsense, let us pass the continuing resolution, let us open up Government again, and then let us negotiate on a balanced budget. One issue has nothing to do with the other.

BOTTOM LINE IN BUDGET BATTLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my colleague and say to him that this is about everything that is important. I have waited 8 years to see my Government finally balance its budget and get its financial house in order, and that is what we are attempting to do.

We are attempting to do three basic things. Get our financial house in order, balance our Federal budget, is one. The second issue is to save our trust funds, particularly Medicare, from bankruptcy. It starts to become insolvent next year and becomes literally bankrupt in 7 years. The third thing we intend to do and are working very hard to, is to change both the social and corporate welfare state into a caring opportunity society.

That is our objective. I know my colleague feels very heated about this issue, but it is really a distortion to talk about cuts to education when education loans are going to go from \$24 to \$36 billion. That is a 50-percent increase in education loans.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. If I could just make some points first. Then if I have some time, I would be glad to.

Again, let me say that we intend to have this go from \$24 to \$36 billion. Only in Washington when you spend 50 percent more on student loans do people call it a cut.

Our Medicaid number is going to go from \$89 to \$127 billion. Again, only in Washington when you spend so much more do people call it a cut.

We are increasing the school lunch program. We are increasing the student loan program. We are increasing Medicare, we are increasing Medicaid.

We are absolutely determined, and this is not something which one part of our party feels strongly about, we, this Republican Conference, have been working all year long to balance our Federal budget. That is what we are going to do. We are going to get our financial house in order.

It is just amazing to me that we have had such a struggle throughout the year.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. No. I will not yield yet. I will be happy to yield later if I have time. I only have 5 minutes.

I do want to make the point and I think it is very important to be made.

We are not saying that it has to be the Republican balanced budget. We do not even come close to saying that.

Yes, we would like to see tax cuts, if it is going to be extended over 7 years. I would be happy to give up any tax cut if we balance the budget in 5 years, but if it is going to take 7 years, I cannot understand why we cannot balance the budget in 7 years with a tax cut. Balance it in 4 or 5 years without a tax cut, it makes sense.

It does not have to be our spending priorities on discretionary spending. Obviously the President and this Congress, Democrats and Republicans, have to weigh in. It is just wrong, in my judgment, for anyone on that side of the aisle to suggest that it has to be our budget. No, it does not. It just has to be balanced in 7 years using the non-partisan numbers of the CBO.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my good friend from Connecticut, when he spoke about taking care of Medicare and not letting Medicare go bankrupt, the actuaries said that it would take \$89 billion to ensure that Medicare would not go bankrupt. Why then under the Republican plan are there \$270 billion worth of cuts?

Mr. SHAYS. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman needs to recognize that we need to make it solvent for many more years, and we want to bring it up to the year 2010, 2011, which is the start of the baby boomers. Your plan brings it to solvency for a few more years but does not get it up to the year 2010, which is our objective. We want to balance our Federal budget, we want to save Medicare, and we want it to be solvent to the year 2010.

I would be happy to yield to my colleague.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a question on the shutdown. You and I had a lengthy discussion yesterday. I raised the issue to you that this shutdown is costing the American people over \$800 million. You indicated to me that you all felt that this was the only way you could get the attention of the President of the United States. So the purpose of this shutdown has nothing to do with the balanced budget but with trying to get the President's attention.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, and I plead this not be used against my time. It is very simple to respond. I wish that 10 years ago this Congress had shut down the Government and balanced our Federal budget, and we would not be in the mess we are in today. Our big regret on this side of the aisle is that we gave the President 30 days to come forward with a balanced budget and he chose not to. That is the bottom line to this issue.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I am happy just to continue with the time that I have left.